





West Indies—and where else to look for them they know not. They say that the ruin of their magnificent colony must be the consequence.

And so the "magnificent colony must be ruined," not by being "overrun with the free blacks," but because they can't get more of them! The spirit of enterprise, it would seem, has taken such a start, in consequence of abolition, that an increased number of laborers are wanted. And this shows, by the by, that the planters are not paying too high a price for their labor. Otherwise they would not be so clamorous for more laborers. If slavery were abolished in our southern states, there is reason to believe that the great demand for laborers there, would be such that the free people of color at the north would flock to the south for employment and the demand for laborers would still be greater than the supply.—*ib.*

## THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.  
CINCINNATI:  
Tuesday Morning, January, 28, 1840

### THE DEMOCRACY.

The profligacy of the leaders of the reigning party in this state, is equalled only by the stupid apathy with which the people regard their acts. Their measures on the bank question are noticed with severity enough, but their atrocious conduct on other questions, of far more moment, as involving constitutional and moral principles, are passed by with indifference. Read the papers of the opposition—what hint can be gathered from any of them, that the legislature, now in session, is waging an unscrupulous war against the rights of man? The most trivial circumstances, if they tend to disparage that body, are detailed with great care. Should the legislature boil over with dignified wrath against a poor newspaper reporter, or lash itself into fury, at the sight of a mock-petition, the facts are duly stated with much formality in all the Whig papers, and their editors seem glad of an opportunity to strike a blow at their opponents. But, let this same body insult a large class of their constituents from day to day, treat their petitions with contempt, outrage the constitution by passing slavery-resolutions, disgrace the state by their servility to the South, and defy the Almighty by persecuting his poor, and these same capricious editors are silent. They can see nothing in all this so reprehensible as certain proceedings against Mr. Clark, or Mr. Thompson, which by the way involve not a single principle! Between such legislators and such opposition-censors, the cause of freedom has little to expect.

We confess we feel humbled. We are known abroad rather as a nation of money-changers, money-seekers, and stock-jobbers, than by our devotion to high principles and pursuits. Mr. Walsh says truly, that foreigners regard with contempt our endless and infinite wranglings about banks and currency. They see nothing in the exclusive devotion of the American mind to these topics, that can recommend American institutions to their judgments.

A democratic convention meets in Columbus. It resolves in favor of this man for governor, and that man for president. It denounces monopolies. It thunders against abolitionism. Free discussion is denied. The simple mention of the doctrine that all men are created free and equal occasions an uproar. Resolutions tend to cover the conduct of the press? We need not speak of democratic editors: they cannot do otherwise than applaud. But, it might be expected that the opposition press would seize the occasion to confound their adversaries. Far from it. Some are silent—some quite amused. Many are delighted that Thomas Morris, one of the few consistent, independent men of his party, too sturdy a freeman to wear a yoke, too ardent a lover of liberty, to wish to impose a yoke on others, is "read out," as the phrase is. They absolutely sympathize with the enemies of human liberty in their rabid proscription. There is more rejoicing at the discomfiture of Thomas Morris, than indignation at the servility of the Convention. If there were a healthy state of public sentiment, who does not see, that the pro-slavery doings of the Convention would be the strongest argument an opposition paper could use against the ruling party? The fact that the Whig press scarcely alludes to them except to jeer at the ostracized democrat, shows the depravity of public sentiment on any question relating to human rights.

At no time, perhaps, has Ohio been sunk so low as at present. A majority of the leaders of the party now in power, is distinguished by intolerance, self-sufficiency and vulgar profligacy. Their proscription of independence of opinion; their base devotion to the slaveholder, their abuse of Abolitionists, their fanatical hatred of the colored man, and their scandalous aggressions on human rights, under the mask of a democracy that is forever bustling about equal rights, are known every where. They act, as if tyranny were the best preservative of power, as if trampling on the weak were the readiest passport to fame, as if justice and humanity might forever be outraged, without arousing the anger of a holy God. Human language cannot paint the black malignity which stains their deeds. They are reckless of the curse of the gods; undisturbed in wickedness; grown daring in infamy under the belief that there is too much depravity in the community to suffer them to be held to an account. "Infamy," says Tacitus, "when beyond all measure great, is the last incentive of an abandoned mind." The truth of this must strike any one, who will be at the pains to reflect on the late proceedings of these men touching the cause of human rights.

There are multitudes of honest democrats in Ohio. Why will they shut their eyes to measures which are undermining their party? Why tolerate as their leaders, men, "deep-drenched in all," whose base deeds crimson with shame the cheeks of those who pray for the prevalence of democratic principles? How can they, without unutterable indignation, witness that brazen hypocrisy, which lifting its head to heaven swears the sacred name of liberty, while at the same time it stamps under foot the poor-colored man all his precious and inalienable rights? Why will they suffer a few unprincipled wretches, self-interesting in all their thoughts, hypocritical in their professions, and who have no more regard for human rights, than the dog who makes murder his trade, to abuse themselves on the public as the representatives of "democracy?"

We pray those of our democratic friends who are honest in their professions, to accompany us in a review of the acts of their leaders, on the slavery-question.

### The Convention.

On the 8th of January, 1840, an immense Convention of Democrats was held at Columbus. The subjects that chiefly occupied their attention were, banks, corporations, currency and abolitionism. Corporations were declared to be the vice of the age. A deep hostility was manifested against every species of monopoly and aristocracy—except the monopoly of slave-labor, and the aristocracy of cotton and sugar. That a few men should enjoy the exclusive privilege of banking, was thought to be an encroachment on the equal rights of the community. That a few planters in the South monopolized the muscle and sinew of three millions of laborers, did not create a ripple of indignation. So far from it, the denunciations of this stupendous monopoly were denounced; and strong resolutions were passed to secure the slaveholding aristocracy from disturbance. "Give us a cheap and simple government of equal laws," said they, "protecting every man in his rights, and securing to labor the fruits of its industry, and we ask no more. We want no laws to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer. Let every man be the architect of his own fortunes."

These are the very principles which slaveholders violate, and Abolitionists daily inculcate. Nevertheless, the Convention excommunicated the latter, and pledged themselves to the former, thereby convicting themselves of the most detestable hypocrisy; for that certainly is the worst hypocrisy, which masks selfish designs with the purest intentions.

But to the record. They issued an address, part of which is devoted to Abolitionism, and is as follows:

"The Abolitionists, another faction, more odious than any one that has hitherto appeared in this country, combining as they do, religious fanaticism with political zeal, and making open war upon the sacred Constitution, framed by our fathers, claim General Harrison as peculiarly their candidate, fudged they openly boast, that they drove Mr. Clay from the field, because he was a slaveholder, and forced the nomination of General Harrison. This faction has organized and openly proclaimed, that it will support no man for office who does not pledge himself in favor of their creed. If they support Mr. Harrison and are true to their own pledges, they must have assurances from him, which are satisfactory. They make all war slavery in the District of Columbia, and in all the States of the Union. Their object is declared to be the total, general, and immediate abolition of slavery, throughout the United States, and throughout the world. They desire to fill Ohio and the other free states, with an ignorant, degraded race of men, to the exclusion of our own people; and to confer upon them the same rights, civil, political and social, as are enjoyed by ourselves. The right of each State in the Union to regulate its domestic institutions, without interference from its sister States, or from the general government, are wholly disregarded by this party, and they openly proclaim that if their object cannot be accomplished without a violation of the sacred Constitution, they are ready to trample it under their feet. With such a faction we can never affiliate. In their attempts to destroy the compromises and guarantees of the Constitution, we regard them as guilty of a species of 'moral treason,' which demands the reprobation of every patriotic citizen in the community. Yet General Harrison is the favorite candidate of this party! The Whigs, Slaveholders and Masons, of the South, the Anti-Masons of the Middle, and the Abolitionists of the North, all unite upon the same man. The principles of these supporters are diametrically opposite to each other; and we are left to conjecture, whether they support him, because he has given secret pledges to each of these factions; or because he has 'no particular principles,' which he cannot abandon at pleasure on coming into power."

To say nothing of their scandalous inconsistency in proscribing a class of men, who follow the principles of the democratic party; there are at least five direct falsehoods in this short paragraph.

1. The Abolitionists "claim General Harrison as peculiarly their candidate." It is false.
2. They "boast," that they "forced the Whigs to nominate General Harrison." It is false.
3. "They desire to fill Ohio with an ignorant, degraded race of men, to the exclusion of our own people." It is false.
4. "The right of each State in the Union to regulate its domestic institutions, without interference from its sister States, or from the general government, are (is) wholly disregarded by this party." It is false.
5. "They openly proclaim that if their object cannot be accomplished without a violation of the Constitution, they are ready to trample it under their feet." It is false.

The following resolutions were also adopted. They are to be taken henceforth as the creed of the leaders of the democratic party in this state on the subject of slavery. We need not say that the last resolution is marked by the same reckless disregard of truth and honesty which characterizes the extract from the address.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this convention, Congress ought not without the consent of the people of the District, and of the states of Virginia and Maryland to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and that the efforts now making for that purpose by organized societies in the free states, are hostile to the spirit of the constitution and destructive to the harmony of the Union.

Resolved, That slavery being a domestic institution recognized by the constitution of the United States, we as citizens of a free state have no right to interfere with it, and that the organizing of societies and associations in free states in opposition to the institutions of sister states will produce of no good, may be the cause of much mischief, and while such associations for political purposes ought to be discontinued by every lover of peace and concord, no sound democrat will have part or lot with them.

Resolved, That a new guise, and the political action of anti-slavery societies, is only a device for the overthrow of democracy.

Political Abolitionism is real democracy,—its only object being, to bring up the legislation of Congress and the free states to the great democratic principle, "equal and exact justice to all men." "The political action" of anti-slavery men, (anti-slavery societies do not act politically,) is intended simply to force both parties to act in accordance with their pretensions of regard for personal rights.

Mr. Morris and another member of the Convention attempted to speak in opposition to the resolutions, but an uproar ensued, and they were coughed down. The Convention was a great stickler for freedom of discussion! The address reckons it one of the glories of Jefferson's administration, that during his term the alien and sedition laws were repealed, "whereby the freedom of speech and of the press were restored to the people." One of the glories of the Convention was, that it would permit no individuals to differ with the majority on the slavery question! Unanimity could be procured, if not by argument, yet by coughing down and hustling out. Even some of the democratic papers furnish hints on this matter. We give an extract from a letter published in the Western Telegraph. "Thomas Morris" was "permitted—to go on at considerable length!" "The resolutions on the subject of abolitionism, were received with rounds of applause. Hon. Thomas Morris, of

Cincinnati, attempted to make some remarks against their passage, and was permitted to go on at a considerable length, although the members of the Convention were anxious to start to their homes. After he concluded his remarks, Mr. Sawyer, from Montgomery county, rose and addressed the Convention. During the course of his remarks, he took occasion to say that the Democratic party had no affinity with the Abolitionists; that the great majority of them were Whigs, and that the Democratic party disclaimed all connection with them; that he considered the gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Morris) as a rotten branch that should be lopped off. This sentiment was received by loud shouts of approval, and Mr. Sawyer, then turned him out of the party, and all other Abolitionists with him! The course taken upon the abolition question, was certainly the correct course. The Whigs have charged it upon us long enough, that a majority of this faction belong to our party. It was time the party should come out and express their feelings upon the subject."

"No sound democrat will have part or lot with them!"—"a rotten branch that should be lopped off!"—"let him go—turn him out of the party, and all other Abolitionists with him!" Such is the language of the democracy of Ohio, or rather of the mobocracy. We are loth to believe that a majority of democrats will countenance such proceedings.

Meantime, what course will Mr. Morris and other democrats who think with him on the question of human rights, pursue? Reviled and abused for their consistency, they see that "democracy in Ohio henceforth is to be distinguished by devotion to slavery." For their honesty, they have been, in effect, politically disfranchised. But one way lies open before them, of re-admittance to their party. They must disavow their principles, and be willing to join with the rank mass of servility in doing homage to the slaveholder. Will they do it? We hope they will not. They will let baseness and depravity work out their own ruin; knowing that when defeat shall have brought consideration and repentance, there will still be power enough in true democratic principles to insure them a speedy triumph. For the time, then, as they respect themselves, as they love their country, as they desire the establishment of their principles, as they believe that the present leaders of their party are hypocrites, let them separate themselves from them.

### The Legislature.

Let us notice a few acts of this body.

We have already been apprised of the hostility of the lower house to the Oberlin Institute, and of the strong opposition made to the passage of a bill to incorporate the Dialectic Association,—on the ground of Abolitionism. The bill having been sent up to the Senate, on the 15th it was read the third time, and the question being, "shall the bill pass?" it was lost—yeas 9, nays 18! The bill was lost, because a majority of the legislature were hostile to the anti-slavery sentiments which distinguish the Oberlin Institute. Who made the legislature a censor of opinions? Whence has it derived its prerogative to punish any portion of its constituents for holding sentiments different from its own? To withhold customary privileges from an association of persons, on the ground that they hold opinions at variance with those entertained by a majority of the legislature, is a wanton abuse of power. It would be just as proper to refuse an act of incorporation to a Methodist or Presbyterian church, because a majority of the Assembly might be opposed to Calvinistic or Arminian doctrines. Equal rights—equal privileges—these are cardinal doctrines in the democratic creed!

Such malignity is not easily suppressed. It offered a resolution, instructing the Committee on Corporations to inquire into the expediency of passing a law to repeal the Charter of the Oberlin Collegiate Institute! The resolution of course was the offspring of a most determined hostility to that institution, growing out of its indefatigable zeal in every cause of moral reform. It has taken high ground on the subjects of human rights, universal education, and moral purity. It has discarded the distinctions of caste, and in the expansive spirit of christian benevolence, thrown open its privileges to the seeker of knowledge, without regard to complexion. Hence this movement in the legislature to break it down.

We ask again of the honest democrat,—does this fanatical hatred of every thing morally excellent, which marks so many of your party, excite in you no indignation?

The resolution was laid on the table, but may soon be called up.

In the Congress of the United States, disgraceful as has been their action against the right of petition, they have not yet proceeded so far as to make a jest of this sacred right. Such infamy is reserved, for a democratic legislature.

On the 17th in the Senate, Mr. Humphreys presented six petitions from his senatorial district, "praying an alteration in the law relating to trial by jury; and also, the repeal of the law of last session on the subject of fugitives from labor in other states, and all laws which make distinction on account of color." They were referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Commerce and Manufactures!

Men that can act in this way are scarcely worthy an honest man's contempt. Meantime, what is the newspaper press about? It is occupied with more important matters. "The river is rising," or "a great quantity of ice is running," or "Newell—News! a great Harrison meeting!" It is of far more moment to record the number of inches in the rise or fall of the river, than to expose and denounce with the spirit of a freeman, the inroads of the legislature on the liberties of the citizens! But, we are not yet done. We are anxious that the world should understand what stuff this legislature is made of.

January 16th, a bill came up the object of which was to prohibit intermarriages between blacks and whites. It emanated, as Mr. Flood informs us, "from the Judiciary Committee of which he had the honor of being chairman." It is an undeniable fact, that there is nothing in the circumstances of the state calling for such a bill. Cases of intermarriages of the kind alluded to are almost unknown. In the instance noticed by Mr. Buchanan, the woman was not an abolitionist, as he insinuates; we doubt very much whether she knows the meaning of the title.

The design of the movement, we presume, was to damage the Whig party. In fact, all the obnoxious measures on the slavery question, have their source partly in political motives. If the Whig members of the Assembly should oppose them, they are branded with Abolitionism, and it is supposed that their acts will occasion a defection from the party of the more rancorous anti-abo-

litionists. If they should join with their opponents, the abolition-members of the party may be alienated. Either way they may lose. Foreseeing this, the democratic leaders scruple not to attempt the most odious measures.

That the bill respecting intermarriages was proposed with this design, is evident from the fact, that these apparent enemies to intermarriages between whites and blacks, are not hostile to amalgamation. The success of their party, they know, depends on the fidelity with which they adhere to slaveholders, among whom the practice of amalgamation is too common to excite much remark. Nay, the very candidate for the vice-presidency, nominated by the Democratic Convention, is, as every body knows, married, in the sight of Heaven, to a woman of color. Men affecting a holy horror at the "high-souled Anglo-Saxon race" should be dishonored by intermarriage with colored people, while at the same time they are pledged to support as their candidate for the second office in the Union a practical Amalgamationist, stand convicted before the world of most ridiculous hypocrisy.

We copy the report of proceedings on this bill from the Columbus Journal, with the remark that a similar one is now under discussion in the Indiana legislature—indicating a singular concert of action among the leaders of the ruling party in the West.

### House of Representatives.

January 16.  
"The bill to amend the act regulating marriages being before the House, (This bill provides, that if any justice, minister, or person authorized to solemnize marriages, shall join in marriage a white and black, or a mulatto person, they shall be fined not less than fifty, nor more than five hundred dollars, or be imprisoned not less than ten nor more than thirty days, or both.)

Mr. Davis moved to recommit it, with instructions to make it provide for the appointment of a board of examiners for each county, to determine and certify persons within the description of white, black and mulatto persons.

Mr. Flood proposed to include in the instructions, a proviso that nothing in the act should prevent an abolitionist from marrying a wench.

Both these motions were negatived.

Mr. Hanna moved an amendment, making the clergyman forfeit his license, if he should be guilty of such a crime.

Mr. Leonard moved to strike out the last section of the bill. He desired the gentleman from Licking (Mr. Flood), might not be prevented from connecting himself with the portion of the human family he thought proper. There were a great many dispositions among men. Why might not all have the liberty of following their own inclination in this matter?

Mr. Flood said the bill emanated from the Judiciary Committee, of which he had the honor of being chairman. It was based on petitions, he believed, from the county of Fayette. Its provisions were deemed salutary, and had received the unanimous concurrence of the committee. It did not reach those who thought proper to marry those of a different color, such a union was made punishable. Many cases of these extraordinary unions had occurred during the last year, in Ohio. Many instances might be related. If the exigencies of the times did not satisfy members why such a law should be enacted, he could offer no stronger reasons.

Mr. Hubbard hoped the motion would prevail. He had some objections to the bill further than what had been urged. If parties were not disposed to unite themselves together in the bonds of matrimony, and (his bill) became a law, he would inquire if a license was not thereby given to adultery? He thought it was nothing less than a license of that kind. The affections of the parties towards each other, tended naturally to a union; and if prevented from having it legally solemnized, an illegal connection would be the necessary consequence. And he would ask if the House were prepared to do what he considered as a license to crime? If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the law, and visiting, with its penalty, the magistrate or minister. Besides, with the amendment now proposed, the clergyman would operate as a license to crime. If the parties had a legal right to place their affections on each other, had the Legislature any power to interpose and cut off these rights? But he had another objection. Why was the penalty made to fall on the clergyman, who was the first to form the connection. The committee, therefore, wished to intercept the right by thrusting in the







